

No. ID/RTK/31-83/30956.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Mange Ram and the management of Managing Director Haryana State Minor Irrigation Tube-Well Corporation Chandigarh, (ii) Executive Engineer Haryana State Minor Irrigation (Tube-well) Corporation Division No. 4, Fatehabad, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Rohtak, constituted,—under section 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,—vide Government notification No. 3864-ASO(E)-Lab/70/13648 dated 8th May, 1970 read with Government notification No. 9641-I-Lab-70/32573, dated 6th November, 1970 the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Mange Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/HSR/131-83/30980.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Man Singh and the management of Executive Engineer Lining Division No. 6 HSMITH Hissar, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Rohtak constituted under section 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,—vide Government Notification No. 3864-ASO(E)-Lab-70/13648, dated 8th May, 1970 read with Government Notification No. 9641-I-Lab-70/32573, dated the 6th November, 1970 the matter specified below, being either matter in dispute or matters relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Man Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/GGN/2-81/30986.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Gyasi Ram and the management of M/s Jawala Textile Mills, Delhi Gurgaon Road, Gurgaon, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Faridabad, constituted,—vide Government notification No. 11495-G-Lab/57/11245, dated 7th February, 1958, read with notification No. 5414-3Lab-68/15254, dated 20th June, 1960 section 7 of the said Act, the matters specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Gyasi Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/HSR/127-82/30993.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri Prem Kumar and the management of M/s. Haryana Roadways Sirsa, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Labour Court, Rohtak, constituted under section 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,—vide Government Notification No. 3864-ASO(E)-Lab-70/13648, dated 8th May, 1970, read with Government notification No. 9641-I-Lab-70/32573, dated 6th November, 1970, the matter specified below, being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and workman for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Prem Kumar was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?